

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

FRANK CARL BARBER, JR.,

Defendant and Appellant.

E058267

(Super.Ct.No. FMB1100619)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. Rodney A. Cortez, Judge. Affirmed.

Renee Paradis, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

A jury found defendant and appellant Frank Carl Barber, Jr., guilty of possession of methamphetamine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11377, subd. (a)), and not guilty of possession of methamphetamine for sale (Health & Saf. Code, § 11378). Defendant was

sentenced to supervised probation for a period of 36 months on various terms and conditions pursuant to Penal Code section 1210.1 (Prop. 36).

Defendant appeals from the judgment. We find no error and will affirm the judgment.

I

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On November 27, 2011, during a search for a parolee at defendant's apartment, officers discovered a nylon bag lying on top of a bed containing a methamphetamine pipe, syringes, a scale, and baggies with a white substance inside. The white substance was 3.96 grams of methamphetamine, worth about \$350. Defendant asserted that he had no idea how the bag got onto his bed. He also claimed that the bag did not belong to him and that he had never seen it before.

II

DISCUSSION

Defendant appealed and, upon his request, this court appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, setting forth a statement of the case, a summary of the facts, potential arguable issues, and requesting this court conduct an independent review of the record.

We offered defendant an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, but he has not done so. Pursuant to the mandate of *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, we have independently reviewed the record for potential error and find no arguable issues.

III

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

RAMIREZ
P. J.

We concur:

HOLLENHORST
J.

KING
J.